

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes Cover Sheet

Please find attached the Open Meeting Minutes from the Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project of December 3, 2001.

If you have any comments or changes to these minutes, please reply to this email and your comments will be incorporated into the next meeting minutes.

Environmental
Restoration
Contractor

ERC Team

Meeting Minutes

Job No. 22192
Written Response Required: NO
Due Date: N/A
Actionee: N/A
Closes CCN: N/A
OU: GW/VZ100
TSD: N/A
ERA: N/A
Subject Code: 8830/4170

SUBJECT GROUNDWATER/VADOSE ZONE INTEGRATION PROJECT MEETING -
DECEMBER 3, 2001

TO Distribution

FROM Michael J. Graham, Groundwater/Vadose Zone Integration Project Manager

DATE January 7, 2002

ATTENDEES

See Attached List

DISTRIBUTION

Attendees
GW/VZ Distribution List
Document and Information Services H0-09

NEXT GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT OPEN MEETING:

Next Meeting: Monday, January 7, 2002 – 1-3 p.m.
Location: Bechtel Hanford, Inc., Assembly Room (Badging Required)
Local Call-In Number: (509) 376-7411
Toll Free Call-In Number: (800) 664-0771

MEETING MINUTES:

A Groundwater/Vadose Zone (GW/VZ) Integration Project Open Meeting was held on December 3, 2001, in Richland, Washington, in the Assembly Room at the Bechtel Hanford, Inc. (BHI) Building.

PROJECT REPORT:

Project Transition (Michael Graham)

The project transition will involve two phases. The Environmental Restoration Contractor (ERC) is managing Phase 1. The scope of Phase 1 encompasses all the Groundwater/Vadose Zone activities, which includes integration, Science & Technology (S&T), System Assessment Capability (SAC), peer review, groundwater operations along the river and on the plateau, well maintenance and decommissioning, and drilling. Basically it includes all of the integration project scope, as well as the 200 Area activities and the facilities and surveillance and maintenance activities on the plateau. Phase 1 of the transition is scheduled to be complete by end of June 2002. Phase 2 encompasses the transition of the rest of the ERC scope, as well as Fluor's work in the 300 Area. Phase 2 of the transition is scheduled to be complete by October 1, 2002.

QUESTION: What's left on the ERC contract?

ANSWER: Our contract is basically up.

QUESTION: Will the Phase 2 work be managed by Bechtel?

ANSWER: It depends on who wins the contract. We will develop the plans for Phase 1 over the next couple of months. The planning for Phase 2 will be done in April, about a month behind Phase 1. I will manage the transition project for BHI. Greg Mitchem is acting project manager while I'm working on the transition.

QUESTION: Do you anticipate a transfer of staff from BHI to Fluor?

ANSWER: According to the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) letter that was distributed, Fluor intends to pick-up the bulk of people on the work scope. Individuals will make their own decisions as to whether or not they go with Fluor. That's a personal decision for people. We will define in the plan how that transfer of staff will work.

QUESTION: I'm still concerned about the continuity of the project with the change over in staff. I hate to see that continuity slow down.

ANSWER: We will all do everything we can to make this a smooth transition.

QUESTION: Regarding the transfer of people, does that refer to CH2M Hill Hanford, Inc. (CHI) people also?

ANSWER: Yes.

TPA Milestone Negotiations (Chris Smith/Bruce Ford)

Chris Smith will address the 100 Area, and Bruce Ford will address the 200 Area.

The effort for the river corridor entails the 100 and 300 Areas. We have an Agreement In Principle (AIP) in place. I will leave a copy here, and after the meeting we can make copies for those of you who would like one. We have been meeting with the Washington State Department of Ecology (Ecology) and DOE, Richland Operations Office (DOE-RL) to work out a Tentative Agreement (TA) by the end of this month. The TA will be out for formal public comment in January 2002. The document should be completed by April 2002. The 100 Area is more advanced in detail; there is more documentation. The scope has been to get all the commitments on the table and capture them. Our aim is to get these done with recognition by all parties that amendments will be made.

QUESTION: What is being negotiated exactly? In what way are negotiations for Tri-Party Agreement (TPA) milestones being mentioned?

ANSWER: There was recognition from the beginning that we didn't want to change a lot. We have a technical approach that has been very successful. We don't want to change anything, but we want to allow flexibility.

Regarding the 200 Area in the central plateau, we are one month behind the 100 Area in schedule. Plans are that the three parties will sign the AIP this week. Proposed TPA change packages will be available by mid-February for public comment. For the 200 Area waste sites, there are four major milestones (M-13, M-15, M-16, and M-20) that will be considered in the negotiations. The negotiations will not involve tank farms or facility milestones. The Office of River Protection (ORP), however, will participate in the development of the AIP and in the TPA negotiations in order to coordinate with DOE-RL.

QUESTION: Is clean up activity mentioned? Can you get out of a commitment later if the characterization changes?

ANSWER: That will be a consideration. The major ones will be the tank farms and solid waste burial grounds. We are looking at those schedules and trying to align with other site closure actions.

We put this on the agenda because we wanted to get discussions started and get it on the table.

COMMENT: I expect a considerable uproar in the upcoming Hanford Advisory Board (HAB) meeting. I hope we can get support back on board for the agency.

Environmental Management Science Program (EMSP) and S&T Workshops (Mark Freshley)

Many of you participated in the EMSP workshop. We reconvened all of the principal EMSP investigators to exchange information with the GW/VZ Integration Project. We thought it was a good meeting, and we received a number of compliments. We asked the investigators to bring a two-page summary, and we will put those in the summary report. There will be some continued interaction in the future.

As for the S&T Roadmap, we feel that it's important to complete, particularly in this transition year,. We are doing this in two separate workshops, the first of which will be January 8 –10, 2002. We will bring representatives from all the national laboratories together who contributed to the first draft of roadmap, as well as those who contributed along the way. There will be breakout groups. The agenda will be made available by December 14, 2001. The second workshop will be to address the remediation technical element. We submitted a request to the DOE office of S&T (EM50) to assist us because they've invested a lot of funding in this area. We want to tap in to the work they've done. The request is being evaluated. The second workshop will occur toward the end of January 2002.

QUESTION: Does your current plan reflect what you've heard from the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) and the Integration Project Expert Panel (IPEP)?

ANSWER: Yes, we will evaluate the NAS comments during the workshops and roadmap. We want to look at what we've accomplished and what remains to be done.

COMMENT: I just want to say that I appreciate the soft cover book of the full NAS Report that you sent. That is a tremendously informative text for a lot of the activities.

ANSWER: The NAS puts together a good panel. It's hard for them to come in and get their arms around the whole picture, but there are some good messages.

QUESTION: Anything new on the vadose zone field study?

ANSWER: It was published on Friday, and it is on the website. I'll work with Gary Jewell to make sure you can find it on the Integration Project website. We are also distributing some hard copies.

Central Plateau Framework (Mary Todd)

We have had a series of meetings since October. We met with the Oregon Hanford Waste Board, the HAB, the technical representatives of the Tribal Nations and, most recently, with DOE, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Ecology, to discuss the groundwater buffer zone. We came up with a conceptual groundwater buffer that will be incorporated into the agreement. In two weeks, there will be a

technical meeting of the site risk assessment experts. The results of these meetings will be used to generate a guidance document. We are planning to draft the document in January and submit it for the public review process in March or April.

QUESTION: Is there still something of value that HAB could contribute?

ANSWER: Moses Jarayssi is in closer contact with on the HAB's activities on this issue. The biggest driver for the 200 Area is the feasibility study for 200-CW-1. The central plateau framework will support and provide consistency to risk assessments for all projects in the central plateau.

QUESTION: Who will sign the document?

ANSWER: The Tri-Parties: EPA, DOE, and Ecology. It will be a primary guidance document under the TPA, and both DOE offices will be involved.

QUESTION: On this guidance document, what will it specifically drive? Will it be based on risk assessment?

ANSWER: Yes. It's not guidance on specific clean up activities. It sets a framework for conducting risk assessments, and each project doing risk assessment in the 200 Areas will use it as guidance.

QUESTION: Why don't we have a project schedule?

ANSWER: I won't let that happen again.

QUESTION: Anything on SAC?

ANSWER: SAC is moving along. The first run was very successful. They found a few glitches and are working on those. They are considering buying some more hardware to make that better. Come next spring, an abbreviated run will be done to check out the glitches.

NOTES:

GW/VZ Web Site location: <http://www.bhi-erc.com/vadose>

If you have questions or comments, please contact Barbara Howard (509-372-9236) or Alison Bryan (509-372-9192).

ATTACHMENTS:

1) GW/VZ Integration Project Four Month Look Ahead Calendar

ATTENDEES:

Martin Bensky – Tri-City Caucus

Alison Bryan – BHI

Don Clarke – DEC

Bruce Ford – BHI

Mark Freshley – PNNL

Dib Goswami – Ecology

Michael Graham – BHI

Mary Harmon – DOE-HQ (by phone)

Kathy Huss – SAIC (by phone)

Edye Jenkins – ERC

Tony Knepp – CHG

Fred Mann – CHG

Greg Mitchem – BHI

John Morse – DOE-RL

Ted Repasky – CTUIR

Gordon Rogers – HAB

Sue Safford – Oregon Office of Energy (by phone)

Steve Sautter – BHI

Chris Smith – DOE-RL

Mike Thompson – DOE-RL

Rob Yasek – ORP

GW/VZ INTEGRATION PROJECT
DECEMBER 6, 2001 – APRIL 1, 2002
FOUR MONTH LOOK AHEAD CALENDAR

December 6-7	HAB (Portland, OR)
December 12	HAB-PI
January 7	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
January 8-10	S&T Workshop for Existing Roadmap Technical Elements (WSU Tri Cities)
February 4	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
March 4	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)
March 27-29	TENTATIVE GW/VZ Integration Project Expert Panel Meeting (BHI Assembly Room)
April 1	GW/VZ Project Open Meeting (1-3 p.m., BHI Assembly Room)